Record of Proceedings

of the

INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST

Court House of the Tribunal War Ministry Building Tokyo, Japan

The United States of America, the Republic of China, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Commonwealth of Australia, Canada, the Republic of France, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, New Zealand, India, and the Commonwealth of the Philippines

-Against-

ARAKI, Sadao; DOHIHARA, Kenji; HASHIMOTO, Kingoro; HATA, Shunroku; HIRANUMA, Kiichiro; HIROTA, Koki; HOSHINO, Naoki; ITAGAKI, Seishiro; KAYA, Okinori; KIDO, Koichi; KIMURA, Heitaro; KOISO, Kuniaki; MATSUI, Iwane; MATSUOKA, Yosuke; MINAMI, Jiro; MUTO, Akira; NAGANO, Osami; OKA, Takasumi; OKAWA, Shumei; OSHIMA, Hiroshi; SATO, Kenryo; SHIGEMITSU, Mamoru; SHIMADA, Shigetaro; SHIRATORI, Toshio; SUZUKI, Teiichi; TOGO, Shigenori; TOJO, Hideki; UMEZU, Youshijiro;

-Accused-

Official Court Reporters

Jack Greenberg, Chief Fred T. Abram James F. Barton Antoinette Duda Samuel Goldberg Robert B. Moras John J. Smith Daphne Spratt Elvira Whalen Julian Wolf Lorraine Velden

INDEX

Of

WITNESSES

Prosecution's Witnesses	Direct	Cross
Ching Teh-chun	2298	2335 2361

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

Pros. No.	Description	Ident.	Evidence
198	Statement made by General Ching Teh-chun	2297	
199	Same as above	2297	
200	Photograph of Pinj-Han Railroad Bridge	2308 2308	2308 2308
201	Bird's-eye view of Lukuochiao	2300	2300

INDEX

Of

MOTIONS, ARGUMENTS, DECISIONS, OBJECTIONS IN OPEN COURT

	Page
Change of American Defense Counsel for Accused TOGO, Shigenori	2296
Statement that Chinese interpreters had been sworn	2299
Objection by Major Blakeney to reading of statements of Ching Teh-chun	2301 2303-2306
Argument re Chinese interpreters Mr. W. F. S. Fang sworn as Chinese	
interpreter Waiver as to certificate	2306 2309
Objection by Mr. McManus as to reading of statements	2324

Page 2.

	Page
Objection overruled	2324
Challenge to Member Honorable Major	
General Myron C. Cramer, Representative of the United States, and arguments	
thereon	2342-2360
Decision Reserved	2360
Challenge overruled and motion dismissed	2361

1	Monday, 22 July, 1946
2	• • •
3	
4	INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL, FOR THE FAR EAST
5	Court House of the Tribunal War Ministry Building Tokyo, Japan
6	Tokyo, Japan
7	
8	The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment,
9	at 0930.
10	
11	
12	Appearances:
13	For the Tribunal, same as before.
14	For the Prosecution Section, same as before.
15	For the Defense Section, same as before with
16	the addition of MAJOR BEN BRUCE BLAKENEY as additional
17	Counsel for Accused TOGO, Shigenori.
18	
19	
20	(English to Japanese, Japanese to
21	English, English to Chinese, and Chinese to
22	English interpretation was made by the
25	Language Section, IMTFE.)
24	
25	

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International h 1 r Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session and ready to hear any matter brought before it. 8 THE PRESIDENT: All the accused are present 4 except OKAWA and HIHANUMA, who are represented by 5 counsel. 6 Does any counsel desire to mention any 8 matter? 9 Mr. Yamaoka. 10 LR. YALAOKA: If the Tribunal please, I de-11 sire to announce this morning the appearance of Major 12 Ben Bruce Blakeney, who is already counsel for General 13 UMEZU, as the additional american defense counsel for 14 the accused TOGO, Shigenori. He has duly filed his 15 appearance with the Secretariat. 16 THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Morrow. 17 COLONEL MORROW: If the Court please, I 18 desire to call out of turn, pursuant to permission 19 of this Court, a witness from the Republic of China, 20 General Ching Teh-Chun. 21 THE PRESIDENT: The Tribunal has no objec-1. tion. You may call the General. 13 COLONEL MORROW: And in connection there-2.1 with, if the Court please, I desire to present two 25 affidavits, entitled document No. 2340 and document

No. 1750, which are statements made by the General, which we intend to submit as his testimony in chief. 2 CLERK OF THE COURT: Document No. 1750 will 3 be marked exhibit 198. Document No. 2340 will be 4 marked exhibit No. 199. 5 (Whereupon, the documents above re-6 ferred to were marked prosecution's exhibits No. 198 and No. 199 for identification.) 8 THE PRESIDENT: This is not an affidavit, 9 Colonel. 10 COLONEL MORKOW: I see I probably in-11 accurately stated what it was. It is a statement. 12 THE PRESIDENT: Well, you have no order 13 14 covering it. COLONEL MORROW: I desire to submit these 15 statements to the General for his scrutiny now. MARSHAL OF THE COURT: Mr. President, the 17 witness is now in court and will be sworn. 18 20 21 22 25 24 25

1	CHING TEH - CHUN, called as a witness,
2	on behalf of the prosecution, being first duly
3	sworn, testified as follows:
1	COLONEL MORKOW: If the Court please, I
5	understand that these statements were taken with
S	the solemnity and in the manner that a truthful
	statement is submitted by a national of the Republic
3	of China.
)	THE PRESIDENT: Is that the Chinese form? .
)	COLONEL MORROW: I understand it is the
1	Chinese form, yes, sir. The General's statements
2	to be received according to his conscience as the
3	truth.
į	THE PRESIDENT: We understand from the
5	representative of China that this is a Chinese
6	form. On that understanding, we will allow you to
	ask the witness whether the contents are true and
8	to swear to their contents in the usual way as if
,	it were an affidavit.
1	DIRECT EXAMINATION
ì	BY COLONEL MORROW:
2	Q I will ask the General therefore, if he is
Y.	General Ching Teh-chus, who has made the statements
1	now in his hands, and if they are the truth, con-
5	stitute the truth in accordance with his conscience?

The facts therein stated are true except for the fact that there are two words which are in error. The first error is with respect to the July 7 Incident, paragraph 2, under "B. Stages of Japanese Aggressions," with reference to economic monopoly. In the Chinese text of the statement the name of the railroad is given in the text as the Tsang-shih Railway. The correct name for this railway is the Tsin-Shih Railway. In the last part of 10 the statement the Chinese text gives my title as 1.1 Commander of the 29th Army, when it should correctly 12 read Deputy Commander of the 29th Army. 13 CAPTAIN BROOKS: If the Tribunal please, 14 for a matter of the record, I don't know whether 15 it has been observed or not whether the Chinese 16 translators have been sworn or not. I would just 17 like, as a point of information, to know whether 18 they have. 19 THE PRESIDENT: I inquired and found that 20 they were. 21 CAPTAIN BROOKS: Thank you. 22 LR. WARREN: If the Tribunal please, some 23

of the defense counsel are under the impression, as
I am, that the Chinese is being interpreted into
Japanese and then from Japanese into English. This

question will arise from time to time. We feel that such a method gives for a very imperfect trans-lation, and if that is the case we ask the Tribunal to rectify it so that the Chinese will be interpreted directly into English, instead of going from Chinese to Japanese and then to English.

COLONEL MORROW: That is not the case here, if the Court please. Did the Court make a ruling on that matter?

THE PRESIDENT: I want to know what is being done, Colonel. Can you tell me?

COLONEL MORROW: I don't know, sir, whether they are translating directly into Japanese or English. I understand what he refers to is the situation now and not the affidavits themselves, or the statements. They have been translated correctly from Chinese to English or vice versa.

LANGUAGE SECTION CHIEF: May it please the Tribunal, I think I can rive some light on this. As it is at present, the English is being interpreted into Japanese and the Japanese is being interpreted into Chinese, and the witness' answer is being translated from Chinese into Japanese and into English. We have one Chinese monitor, who monitors the Chinese-Japanese translation, and we

have one Japanese-English monitor, who supervises the Japanese-English.

THE PRESIDENT: That appears to be in order.

e understand that substantially the position is

this: That the Chinese is being translated into

6 English directly from the Chinese and not through

7 the Japaness.

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19:

20

21

2

24

8 IR. WARREN: If the Tribunal please, that 9 does not appear to be the case.

LANGUAGE CLOTION CHIEF: May I clarify that point? The Chinese into Japanese, then Japanese into English. We do not have any one who speaks Chinese and English. We only have a Japanese-English interpreter and a Chinese-Japanese interpreter. No Chinese-English interpreter.

would like to enter an objection to proceeding out of turn on this witness until proper interpretation is provided. The transfer of the thought from Chinese to Japanese and then from Japanese to English, when the characters and ideologies are purely in the translator's hands, a double translation like that endangers a lot of time. The thoughts and expressions of the ran's ideas as put before the Court involves a legal precept, because the play on the words and

ideas can mean various things. I think for a matter of expediency and fairness in the trial, all of those intervening factors that can be cut out should be done if possible. I believe it is possible to get proper translators.

.

11

Thalen & Duda

THE PRESIDENT: The Court is fully aware of all the matters stressed by Mr. Brooks and is keeping them in mind, and for these reasons the Court thinks the translation should be from Chinese into English direct if we have the translators to it. We think there must be translators in Tokyo today who can do this. We think if you made an effort to get them you would succeed.

by the prosecution. Of course, the matter is to be decided by the Court. At first we were told that the members of the prosecution, Chinese members of the prosecution, perhaps would not be good parties to translate for the witness produced by the prosecution. That was why Chinese members, Chinese assistants, on the prosecution were not asked to translate. We did not offer that service.

Of course, this matter was for the Court to decide. If the Court thinks that the members, assistants, on the prosecution could do the translation work, that is different. So, in the absence of other members who could do the Chinese translation, this arrangement was made, I understand.

THE PRESIDENT: It will never do to have prosecution translators except perhaps in some great

9

11

1.2

14

15

extremity which I do not contemplate.

we have been asking merely reliminary questions here. We have monitors whose sworn duty it is to accurately criticize what roceeds. And I am requesting, if the Court, rlease, or asking that we be allowed to read these affidavits, at all events, because this has been done as to the affidavits; namely, a translation direct from Chinese to English. So far the translations have been merely of reliminary questions.

THE PRESIDENT: If the difficulty is great now, it is going to be insuperable when you reach the stage of cross-examination. So you had better endeavor to get a Chinese who can translate from Chinese into English, or an Englishman, or somebody.

have several young men here from China who can do this job. It may be that there is the rossible disability that they have been from the prosecution, but we have a monitor and if there is no objection on the rart of defense, we might go forward with the affidavits and when the time comes have these gentlemen do the translating.

I understand that Judge Mei has an assistant here, if the Court rlease, that may be used.

4

7

8

9

10.

11

34

13

10

15

10

15

19.

20

2. 1

THE PRESIDENT: I think you should get a man from the Chinese Mission.

colonel Morrow: If the Court please, I understand that the translators here were chosen by the Court. That was not a function of the prosecution, and we are in the situation of having the criticism on the part of the defense of the facilities offered by the Court for conducting this trial.

THE PRESIDENT: The Court made appointments as necessity arose from time to time. You have not advised that this difficulty was going to arise, and we could not know except from you. But we do not want recriminations. We want this matter straightened out at once.

COLONEL MORROW: If the Court please, the prosecution notified the Secretary of the Court about this situation several weeks ago that we expected Chinese to be introduced as witnesses and asked about the translation and understood it was to be furnished. We had no way of anticipating this problem.

THE PRESIDENT: I understand that Justice Mei's secretary, who would be in an impartial position, would be able to make the necessary translations if there is no objection from the defense.

MR. WARREN: If the Tribunal please, I have

81

heard no objection voiced from any defense counsel, and there does not appear to be any objection. One defense counsel did suggest that perhaps we should reserve the right to a monitor. Personally I would not insist on that, but I am expressing the view of the other counsel as they have a right to be expressed. We think that that would be a convenient temporary arrangement until proper arrangement can be made to relieve the assistant, if he would be kind enough to assist us.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. Justice Mei's secretary, Mr. Fang, is prepared to act and will now be sworn in as interpreter. This is a temporary arrangement only, of course, and we must take steps immediately to have translators provided.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The interpreter will now be sworn, Mr. President.

(Whereupon, Mr. W.F.S. Fang was sworn as Chinese-English and English-Chinese interpreter.)

THE PRESIDENT: You must begin again, Colonel Morrow.

COLONEL MORROW: I suggest, if the Court please, that I be allowed to proceed where we stopped, and if there is any question about these preliminary questions--

THE PRESIDENT: I said you must begin again.

COLONEL MORROW: Begin again?

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

13

19

20

31

14

25

BY COLONEL MORROW (Continuing):

Q I will ask the witness to look over the two statements which have been presented to him and state whether or not those are and constitute part of his sworn testimony in this case?

A I have read this over and they were my statements.

- Q Are those statements true and correct?
- A Yes, they are.
- Q I also desire to present to the witness exhibits No. 2211 and 2212 and ask if he can identify the same and what they are?

A This is a bridge between Lukuochiao. Here is a railroad bridge which is Pinj-Han Railroad Bridge across the Yunting River. The second one is a bird's-eye view of Lukuochiao.

THE PRESIDENT: Those exhibits will be tendered? They are tendered for identification so far. Now they are finally tendered, are they?

COLONEL MORROW: I should have said documents instead of exhibits, if the Court please.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Document No. 2211 will be exhibit No. 200. Document No. 2212 will be exhibit No. 201.

(Whereupon, the documents above

referred to were marked prosecution's exhibits
Nos. 200 and 201 for identification.)
THE PRESIDENT: Admitted.

(Whereupon, prosecution's exhibits

Nos. 200 and 201 were received in evidence.)

COLONEL MORROW: Unless there is objection,

if your Honor please, I want to read these documents

or exhibits commencing with document No. 2340 which

are the testimony of the witness.

MR. BROOKS: If the Tribunal please, I do not believe the prosecution has shown any tie-up between the English translation here and the Japanese or Chinese, whichever it is, that was handed to the witness. It does not show that that has been checked in any way, that it is proper. At least we have not seen it.

The prosecutor hands me a certificate here by someone stating that this has been translated by him to the best of his ability and knowledge, and I do not know whether that will be considered as sufficient or not. The man evidently was not sworn in this Court. I do not know his name. I think it is Liu. I think there should be a further showing that this is accurate, and we should have it through the witness that it is accurate.

THE PRESIDENT: Unless the defense is prepared

11

12

13

11

15

16

1-

18

19

20

21

2.2

25

to accept the certificate you must call the person responsible for the translation from the English to the Chinese.

COLONEL MORROW: If the Court please, the gentleman who did the translating is here. He has the certificate in his hands. And it seems to me we have made prima facie proof here that the translation is correct. If the Court desires him sworn he may be sworn as a preliminary witness here.

THE PRESIDENT: The Court has no particular desires except to do the right thing. It may be the defense will accept that certificate.

COLONEL MORROW: Unless the defense indicates a desire to waive their objection, I will ask this witness be sworn.

THE PRESIDENT: It might save time to swear him.

MR. BROOKS: If the Tribunal please, although this man is a part of the prosecution's staff, I think that defense will be satisfied if the corrections can be made at a later time. But we will have to have made available to us in some way some kind of a Chinese-English translator that could check this for accuracy, and if we can make corrections at a later time we will be willing to waive the aforementioned certificate.

12 :

1.5

15

I had not seen this certificate; I did not know what it was.

THE PRESIDENT: We refer the defense to the Language Section for any help they need. In the meantime we will make any necessary appointments of Chinese translators.

Proceed, Colonel Morrow.

COLONEL MORROW: If the Court please --

THE PRESIDENT: Better tender that certificate.

COLONEL MORROW: Very well. I will submit this certificate to the Clerk.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted.

COLONEL MORROW: If the Court please, I desire to read now exhibit 199, which was document 2340.

Breenonce & Barro

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"FACTS OF JAPANESE AGGRESSION IN NORTH CHINA

"(I) NORTHERN CHAHAR INCIDENT

"In June 1935, two Japanese army officers and two Japanese soldiers came from Doran by motor car and passed through Chang Pei District en route to Kalgan. When they arrived at the north gate of the Chang Pei District, they did not submit themselves to the inspection of the guards, nor did they possess entry permits. (Regulation requires that Japanese entering the Province of Chahar should secure in advance through the Japanese Consul at Kalgan entry permits from the Chahar Provincial Government.) Under these circumstances, the commanding officer of the guards at the north gate of the Chang Pei District took these four men to the Headquarters of General CHAO Tang-yu, Commander of the 132nd Division. inside the city of Chang Pei. Commander CHAO asked by telephone for instructions from General SUNG Che-yuan, Commander of the 29th Army, at Kalgan, who permitted these Japanese to proceed to Kalgan through Chang Pei, stressing, however, that this should not be taken as a precedent and that hereafter those desiring 30 enter the Province must have entry permits with them as prescribed by regulations. These four

Japanese went on to Kalgan, and further proceeded to Peiping.

"After the departure of the said Japanese, HASHIMOTO, the Japanese Consul at Kalgan, suddenly protested, alleging that while the guards demanded to search these Japanese officers and men at the north gate of the Chang Pei District they aimed their rifles at them, and that they were detained for four or five hours after arriving at the Headquarters of the Division, and that such constituted insults to the Japanese army men. He demanded the punishment of responsible officers and apology from the Chinese authorities. He also demanded assurance against recurrence of similar nature. General SUNG ordered me to negotiate in the capacity of the Deputy Commander of the 29th Army. After several talks, HASHIMOTO suddenly announced that the situation of the incident became grave and it was beyond the power of the Consul to settle it. The matter was referred to the Headquarters of the Japanese Garrison Forces in Tientsin. Major General DOHIHARA was the representative of the Garrison Forces. Thereupon, I went to Peiping and DOHIHARA also arrived at Peiping, where we proceeded with our negotiations.

25

10

11

12

13

14

15

13

19

20

31

22

23

24

14

.5

13

30

22

25

24

"The results of the negotiations were roughly as follows:

- "(a) The Regiment Commander who was in charge of the garrison at the said gate should be dismissed and punished.
- "(b) The Judge Advocate of the Headquarters of the 132nd Division who detained these Japanese officers should be dismissed and punished.
- "(c) The units of the 29th army should be withdrawn from Paochang, Kangpao, Shangtu, Kuyuan and Huateh (Chia-pu-shih), these being Districts north of Chang Pei. The maintenance of peace and order there should be entrusted to the Peace Preservation Corps.
- "(d) Chinese should henceforth refrain from migrating to and settling in the northern part of the Chahar Province.
- "(e) Activities of the Kuomintang Party should be withdrawn from the Chahar Province.
- "(f) Anti-Japanese institutions and anti-Japanese acts in the Chahar Province should be banned.

"The proceedings and the results of the said negotiations were telegraphically reported to the Central Government by General SUNG and myself asking for the Government's necessary approval. The Chinese

DIRECT

1	Government, in seeking for peace, did not refrain
2	from making compromises one after another, yet the
3	progress of the aggressions by Japanese militarists
4	never coased. During the said negotiations, although
5	TAKAHASHI, Wataru, Military Attache of the Japanese
6	Embassy in China, also participated, it was DOHIHARA,
7	Kenji, who actually controlled the whole thing.
8	"(II) INDUCEMENT AND THREAT BOTH
9	PRIOR TO AND AFTER THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE
10	HOPEI-CHAHAR POLITICAL COUNCIL
11	"When General SUNG Che-yuan was appointed
12	as the Garrison Commander of the Peiping and Tientsin
13	Area in September 1935, the Japanese sent DOHIHARA to
14	Peiping many times to instigate attempting to form a
15	North China Autonomous Government, to estrange the
16	local government from the central government.
17	"The inducement tactics were:
18	"(a) To install General SUNG Che-Yuan as
19	the leader of the North China Autonomous Government.
20	"(b) Japanese would extend every possible
21	aid concerning military and economic affairs in North
22	China.
23	"This was repeatedly expressed by DOHIHARA
24	to Mr. SHIAO Cheng-Ying, ex-Mayor of Tientsin, but
25	was refused on all occasions by the Chinese side.

1	Later, MATSUMURO, Koryo, the Chief of the Japanese
2	Special Service Board in Peiping, and TAKAHASHI,
3	Mataru, the Military Attache of the Japanese Embassy
4	continued to make such demands from time to time.
5	They failed altogether. The Central Government
6	appointed General SUNG Che-yuan as the Chairman of
7	the Hopei-Chahar Political Council, to be in charge
8	of military and political affairs in Hopei and Chahar
9	Provinces and in Peiping and Tientsin. General SUNG's
0	measures in military and political affairs all con-
1	formed to the wishes of the Central Government, such
2	as the election for the people's Congress, and the
13	concentrated military training of college students,
4	all to the disfavor of the Japanese, The Japanese
15	then realized that their inducement tactics had failed.
16	"So the Japanese changed their inducement
7	tactics into threatening actions, which were as fol-
18	lows:
19	"(a) Political
20	1. According to the Japanese demand
21	General SUNG should announce by circular telegrams the
2.2	establishment of a North China Autonomous Government.
23	
24	2. The Central Government's personnel
25	in change of publicity still remaining in North China
	should be withdrawn.

8

9

10

11

15

21

25

24

25

3. Public opinion in Peiping and Tientsin should be controlled and opposition to autonomy should not be permitted.

(The above three demands were directly presented by DOHIHARA and TAKAHASHI, Wataru, to Mr. SHIAO Cheng-ying)

"(b) Economic

- 1. A railway should be constructed between Tientsin and Shih-chia-chuan.
- 2. The custom tariffs at the Tientsin Maritime Customs should be so revised as to increase the tariff of European and American commodities, and to decrease that of Japanese commodities.

(The above two items were demanded by DOHIHARA and MATSUI, the Chief of the Japanese Special Service Board in Peiping, through Mr. Chen Cho-sung, the Director of the Peiping and Liaoning Railway, to General SUNG and myself. These demands were refused by us.)

"(c) Military

In September 1936, the Fengtai Incident occured. A company of Japanese soldiers carried out maneuvers in Fengtai. They passed through the garrison line of the Chinese Army. Clash ensued when our patrols attempted to halt them. Although

11

17

18

21

33

23

21

25

it was immediately settled, the Japanese use this as a pretext for reinforcement of their troops which occupied Fengtai. It was a battalion, under the command of Major ICHINOGI, Kiyonao.

"Besides, there was another instance. MATSUI, Iwane, in the Autumn of 1975, came to Peiping. He was a General in retirement at that time, and advocated Greater Asiaism. He hoped to establish a branch of the Greater Asia Association in Peiping. Through the introduction of Mr. CHEN Cho-sung, Director of the Peiping and Liaoning Tailway, he met General SUNG and myself. Both of us expressed our disfavor. MATSUI, in his conversation with me, advocated that Asia should be the Asia of the Asiatics, and that European and American influences should be expelled. I smiled and replied, saying that I was afraid that "hat he meant by Asia of the Asiatics was actually the Asia of the Japanese. Unless there were real equality and reciprocity, nothing could be discussed."

(Signed) "CHING Teh-chun

"Formerly, Deputy Commander of the 29th Army.

"At present, Vice-Minister, Ministry

of National Defense.

"Dated: 10 June 1946, at Manking."

And I have also an affidavit here -- a 1 statement, if the Court please -- which is No. 2 118, entitled -- exhibit 198, not 118, if the 3 Court please: 4 "A FACTUAL ACCOUNT OF JULY 7th INCIDENT. 5 6 By General Ching Teh Chun. 7 "(Formerly Mayor of Peiping and con-8 currently Vice-Commander of the 29th Army. At 9 present, Vice-Minister of Military Operations) 10 "1. PROLOGUE 11 "A. The Political and Military Conditions in 12 Hopei and Chahar Provinces Prior to the War of 13 Resistance. 14 "1. Political -- Before the Incident of 15 July 7th, the hopei-Chahar Political Council was 16 the responsible institution in charge of political 17 affairs in Hopei and Chahar Provinces. General 18 Sun Che-Yuan was the Chairman of the said Council, 19 being appointed by the National Government. 20 Council had jurisdiction over Hopei and Chahar 21 Provinces and Peiping and Tientsin Municipalities, 22 General Feng Chi-An and General Liu Ju-Ming were 23 the Governor of Hopei Province and Chahar Province 24 respectively. I, myself, was then Mayor of 25 Peiping, while General Chang Chi-Chung, who later

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

fell gallantly for the country as Commander-in-Chief, was then Mayor of Tientsin.

"Since their costless invasion of the Chinese North-Eastern three Provinces, followed by the invasion of the Jehol Province, and the Battle of the Great Wall, the Chinese aggressors considered all these Provinces in North China as something that could be very easily taken over. Peiping and Tientsin, therefore, became the front line of national defense. However, all the policies of the local authorities in Hopei, Chahar, Peiping and Tientsin were formulated and carried out in conformity with instructions and laws proclaimed by the National Government. For example, the election of representatives of the People's Congress, the concentrated military training of all college students, were considered by the Japanese aggressors as measures inconsistent with the status of special area. Repeatedly, Japanese opened negotiations and interfered with such administration, but all the inducements and threats failed. Finally they resorted to the military aggression on July 7th, 1937.

"2. Military -- In North China, the 29th Army was the main force, which had its garrisons

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

all over Hopei, Chahar, Peiping and Tientsin. At the time of the Indicent, the 37th Division under the command of General Feng Chi-An was stationed in the suburbs of Peiping, namely, Nan-Yuan, Peip-Yuan, Si-Yuan, Lukuochiao (Marco Polo Bridge), Chan-Sin-Tien, and Paoting. The 38th Division under the command of General Chang Chi-Chung was stationed at Tientsin, Young-Chung, Langfang, Chuan-Liak, Chen, Taku, Tangku, and along the Tientsin-Pukow Railway such as Na-Chan and Tsangchow. The 143rd Division under the command of General Liu-Ju-Ming was stationed in the Chahar Province, at Kalgan, Chang-Pei, Chai-Kuo-Pao, Yeng-Ching, Nankow, etc. The 132nd Division under the command of General Chao-Teng-Yu was spread over the southern part of Hopei Province, namely, Ta-Ming, Ho-Chien, Hsien-Hsien, Jen-Chiu, etc.

"Lukuochiao (Marco Polo Bridge), where
the Incident of July 7th broke out, is situated
about 20 Li southwest to the Chang-Yi Gate of
Peiping City. The District Government of the
Wan-Ping Hsien was at the east of the bridge.
The city of Wan-Ping was not large. Both inside
and outside of the city of Wan-Ping were guarded

24

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

by troops of the 37th Division. This place, being on the main communication line west of Peiping, was strategically very important. Japanese forces. stationed at Fengtai, had repeatedly demanded the withdrawal of the Chinese garrison from this place, and also from Chan-Sin-Tien. All these demands were refused by our side in unmistakeable terms. In the winter of 1936, Japanese intended to reinforce their garrison force, and planned to build barracks and airfield in the area between Fengtai and Lukuochiao (Marco Polo Bridge), in order to control completely North China. In spite of their efforts in repeated negotiations, we refused them in severe wordings. Thus frustrated, Japanese changed their tactics. They attempted to lay their hands on the local inhabitants by inducing and threatening them to lease or sell the lands voluntarily to the Japanese. But, according to the report of Commissioner Wang Leng-Chai, who governed that area, the local residents had no intentions to lease or to sell the lands belonging to them. The residents made sworn statements to that effect and authenticated these statements with their finger prints. One day, HASHIMOTO, the Chief of Staff of the Japanese Garrison Forces

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

in North China, Wachi, and some other Japanese officers called on me and again requested to buy They argued that the local inhabithese lands. tants desired to lease or sell voluntarily, yet it could not be realized, apparently due to the opposition of the Government in North China. reply was that, no right of land in any country could be freely leased or sold to foreigners. If we asked for a lease or purchase of land in the vicinity of Tokyo, could that be allowed by your Government. In the last minimum, landed properties owned by private persons who enjoy ownership of such properties could not be disposed of by the Government at will. Since you asserted that the residents were willing to sell their lands, what was the proof of this assertion. HASHIMOTO countered by demanding us to produce proof of the unwillingness to lease or sell their lands on the part of the residents. Upon this I produced the sworn statements of the residents authenticated with their finger prints and forwarded to me by Commissioner Wang, to the effect that they would not sell any land. HASHIMOTO and other Japanese officers, upon seeing these documents, could not say anything. This episode which brought dis-

23

24

25

grace and anger to them must have embittered them. From that time on, under the pretext of maneuvers 2 they hoped to invade and occupy Wan-Ping City by 3 catching us unprepared. This was the immediate cause leading to the outbreak of the Indicent. 5 Stages of Japanese Aggressions 6 "1. Alienation and Estrangement -- The Japa-7 nese attempted to alienate and estrange the local 8 9 authorities in North China from the Central Govern-10 ment by inducements and by threat hoping thereby to 11 disintegrate and destroy separate areas one after 12 another. The numerous attempts they made could 13 be summed up as inducements by bribery and threat 14 by force. All these attempts, however, were met 15 with flat refusal from the local authorities. 16 Their conspiracy could by no means be realized. 17 This was the first stage of enemy aggression in 18 North China, a period running roughly from the 19 Autumn 1935 to the Summer 1936." 20 THE PRESIDENT: This is a convenient 21 break, Colonel Morrow. We will adjourn now for

fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1045, a recess was taken until 1100, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows).

Wolf & Spratt

7

S

9

10

11

12

13

14

15.

16

17

15

19

20

22

25

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The Tribunal is now resumed.

MR. McMANUS: If your Honor rlease, I would like to interrose an objection to the continuance of the reading of this document. It obviously contains the theories and orinions of the witness here, and does not confine itself to the statement of facts.

THE FRESIDENT: It certainly should not be in that form, but I am afraid we will have to receive it for what probative value it has, Mr. McManus.

COLONEL MORROW: May I rroceed, if the Court rlease?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

nomic Monopoly--The Japanese hoped to attack economic monopoly under the mask of friendship and fraternization and the watchword, tequality and reciprocity.

The concrete demands made by them were: a. To construct a Tsang-Shih Railway (between Tsangchow and Shih-Chia-Chwang, both in southern Hopei), b. To develop the Lung-Yen Iron Mines (in Chahar Province), and c. To revise Maritime Custom Tariffs at Tientsin, in such a way as to raise tariffs on European and American commodities, and to lower tariffs on Japanese commodities.

2

4

6

,

9

10

12

13

14

16

17

18

20

21

25

25

"All these demands, the acceptance of which would impair the sovereignty of China, were flatly refused. This was the second stage of Japanese aggression in north China. The period covered ran roughly from the Summer 1936 to the Spring 1937.

"Threat by Armed Forces -- After realizing that alienation, estrangement, and attempts to attain economic monopoly had all failed, the Japanese finally decided upon threat by armed force. They hoped to reach their goal without fighting. At the beginning of the Lukuochiao (Marco Polo Bridge Incident), Japanese had no anticipation other than Chinese submission after a blow dealt to the Chinese by their comparatively superior forces. They anticipated that Hopei. Shansi, Shantung, Chahar, and Dueiyuen Provinces could thus be turned into a region of special status, thus realizing the second step in the plan of General TANAKA for the conquest of the whole world. They never thought that, at the call of our supreme leader, all Chinese would rise and take up the War of Resistance on all fronts. As to the drawn-out "ar of Resistance over long, long period, and the fact that we never wavered all the way through, was even more unexpected by the enemy.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

13

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

II. FACTUAL ACCOUNT OF THE INCIDENT

"At 0010, in the evening of July 7th, 1937, I received a report from the Hopei-Chahar Foreign Affairs Commission, which stated that the said commission had received a telephone call from MATSUI, the Chief of the Japanese Epecial Service Board, saying: 'One company of Japanese troops, in night maneuver in the vicinity of Lukouchiao (Marco Polo Bridge) just a while ago, seemed to have heard a few gun shots fired by soldiers of the 37th Division of the 29th Army stationed in the city of "an-Ping. The gun shots brought some confusion of the troops in maneuver. As a result of the roll call, one Japanese soldier was found to be missing. Japanese troops demanded to enter and search the city of "an-Ping this very evening.' The said commission asked instructions by telephone as to how to deal with the situation. I immediately replied that Japanese troops, maneuvering in Chinese territory at their own will, were in violation of international law. Neither had they notified us in advance, nor had they obtained our permission. The Chinese Government has no responsibility whatsoever for the alleged missing soldier. Even if it is true that a soldier was really missing, we shall order the Chinese troops

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

stationed at Lukouchiao (Marco Polo Bridge) to conduct a search for the Japanese soldier on our own behalf in cooperation with local police forces. My instructions were transmitted to the Japanese by the Hopei-Chahar Foreign Affairs Commission. Soon thereafter, the said commission again telephoned me and reported that after transmission of the reply, both the Japanese Special Service Board and the Japanese troops were not satisified. The Japanese insisted on conducting a search in the city by force. If refused, they decided to encircle the walled city. I again immediately replied that in case of such unreasonableness on the part of Japanese, so violent and barbarious we, for the sake of self-defense. could only take the course of resolute resistance. Then I called on Regiment Commander Chi Sin-"en over the telephone. At that time, one battalion of the regiment under his command was in charge of garrison duties at Lukuochiao, while other two battalions and his Regiment Headquarters were at Chan-Sin-Tien. asked Commander Chi whether his regiment had maneuvered tonight. Chi replied in the negative. I asked him whether there were any Japanese troops maneuvering in the vicinity of Lukuochiao (Marco Polo Bridge). Chi replied that he had received no such information,

24

25

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

but that he would immediately send out his men to investigate. Thereupon, I informed him the negotiations between the Japanese and us, and ordered him to send at once able men to proceed toward the direction of Fengtai, to detect possible Japanese troop movements. On the other hand, I ordered by telephone Commissioner "ang Lun-Chai, who was concurrently the Magistrate of "an-Ping Hsien, to investigate and to report on the maneuvering of Japanese troops and whether any Japanese soldier was missing. Soon, I received a telephone call from Commander Chi, who reported that, according to the report of the officer dispatched towards the direction of Fengtai, about a bettalion of Japanese troops with six pieces of artillery, was now advancing from Fengtai to Lukuochiao (Marco Polo Bridge) and whether there was any reinforcements following this column had to await further detection. Thereupon, as the Vice-Commander of the 29th Army, I immediately ordered Regiment Commander Chi to well guard the city of "an-Ping, that not a single Japanese soldier was to be allowed to come in, that not a single inch of territory was to be allowed to lose, that in virtue of our responsibility as soldiers, to guard our territory, the "an-Ping city would be, in case

19

21

22 23

24

4

8

10

11

15

14

15

16

17

15

10

21

22

of necessity, the most precious and glorious graveyard of our ranks and files, that we should share the same fate with the city. If they did not open fire first, we should not first open fire upon them. If they should first open fire, we were sure to deal them fatal blows. After having my order, Chi sent enother battalion to enforce the guard at Lukouchiao (Marco Polo Bridge), and he himself led the battalion there to reinforce the defense. At the same time, Commissioner "ang Lun-Chai came to Peiping to report in person the factual result of his investigation. So, I sent Commissioner "ang, together with Wei Tsung-Han, Commissioner of Foreign Affairs of Hopei-Chahar Provinces, Lin Ken-Yu, also a member under Commissioner "ei, and Chou Jun-Ye, Chief of Communication Section, of the Pacification Headquarters, to negotiate with MATSUI. At 0500 in the morning, successive reports informed me that Japanese troops had come to the edge of the city and demanded the entry of the city by force, that we had to prepare for the defense on the one hand and to try to stop their entry by negotiation on the other. The Japanese, realizing by that time that there was no hope for them to take the city of "an-Ping without fighting, finally encircled it on three sides. Our forces put up defense

works on the walls. Around 0600, enemy machine gun fire began to attack the city, and enemy forces came towards it. This was the very beginning of the Sino-Japanese war, but the responsibility of the Incident was also definitely fixed (upon Japan).

was also definitely fixed (upon Japan). "Hostilities on the 8th and 9th of July were heavy, and Japanese suffered many casualties. 7 The railway bridge leading to Chan-Sin-Tien was occupied by Japanese in the morning of the 8th, and on 9 the same night, two companies of Chinese troops, 10. each soldier equipped with a pistol, a sword, and 11 four hand grenades, moved up stealthily. They sud-12 13 denly attacked, when they approached the bridge head. 14 The enemy, about a company strong, was surprised and 15 most of them were killed. Japanese, seeing that 16 they were suffering setbacks, sent MATSUI and others 17 to me on the following day, and asked for negotiation. 18 I had foreseen their intention before they came, so 19 I refused them. Soon thereafter, they came again 20 and explained the intention of truce, adding that 21 the missing soldier had already been found, so that 22 a peaceful settlement would be feasible. We began to discuss and, as a result, decided on three conditions: (a) All military actions should cease on both sides, (b) Troops of both sides should return

()

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

IS

19

201

21

22

23

21

25

to their original positions, and (c) the 37th Division which entertains more hostile feelings against Japan, should be replaced by some other unit of the 29th Army for the defense of "an-Ping City. An understanding was also reached that both sides should refrain from developing henceforth incidents of similar nature. Yet, these conditions were nothing but Japanese tactics to delay and thus to gain time. Utilizing this breathing space, units of the Kwantung Army were sent to Peiping and Tientsin area for attack. "e detected their conspiracy, and had to order hastily the Division under the command of General Chao stationed in Ta-ming and Ho-Chien in southern Hopei to proceed to Peiping. At that time, General Sung Che-Yuan was on leave of absence in his home town in Shantung. After my repeated telegrams asking for his return, he arrived in Peiping on the 12th of July. "e discussed strategies and policies. "ar again broke out on the 14th, and more intensified than before. Every day, enemy shelled the "an-Ping city by artillery, to cover the edvance of their infantry, but were all repulsed by our army. On the 25th of July, enemy sirplane, in reconnaissance over the Peiping-Taming highways discovered that our troops of large numbers were advancing

northward, and the spearhead had already arrived at Nanyuan. On the 26th of July, Japanese handed us an ultimatum to the effect that the 37th Division be withdrawn from the Peiping area within 24 hours, failing which they would attack us by large forces. To defend ourselves, we attacked immediately on the 27th enemy troops at Fengati and in the vicinity of Lukuochiao (Marco Polo Bridge). In the same evening, we killed quite a number of Japanese at Fentai, re-0 captured the west flank and the south flank of 10 Fengtai, and pressed on near the enemy headquarters 11 there. KATSUKI, Seiji, the Japanese Commander in 12 Chief, ordered Japanese reinforcements from Tungchow 13 and Tientsin, with strong equipment and more than 30 14 airplanes, to make an onslaught. In the early morn-15 ing of the 28th, the enemy with the combined forces of the land and air, fiercely attacked Nan-yuen with 17 all their strength. Large scale hostilities developed 18 with heavy casualties unprecedented since the outbreak incident. Around 2 p.m., most regretfully, 20 General Chao Tung-Yu, Division Commander, General 21 Tung Ling-Kou, Vice Army Commander, were both killed 22 in action. Casualties reached more than 5,000 in-23 cluding both dead and wounded among our officers 24 and soldiers.

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

"Some time before this, repeated telegrams from our Supreme Commander (Generalissimo Chiang) ordered General Sung, Chairman of the Hopei-Chahar Political Council to proceed to Paoting (in southern Hopei) and to direct operations from there. General Sung now acted as directed by these orders. I myself went to Paoting with him in the night of 28th. Considerable success was scored by the Chinese forces in Tientsin, who made their attacks bravely on the 29th and 30th of July. Subsequently they also evacuated according to orders received. They fell back to the south of Tientsin along the Tientsin-Pukow Railway, while other troops were put up along the Peiping-Hankow Railway. In close collaboration between each other, they began to engage themselves in long-term Resistance against the enemy. This was what happened during the Lukouchiao (Marco Polo Bridge) Incident and the "ar of Resistance thereafter.

"Leading Japanese officers who instigated this Incident were:

KATSUKI, Seiji, Commander in Chief of the Japanese Garrison Forces in Tientsin

KAWABE, Seiso, Brigadier Commander MUTAGUCHI, Renyam, Regiment Commander

SAKAI, Takashi, Ex Chief of Staff of the Japanese Garrison Forces in Tientsin

"But the instigator at the very beginning of Japanese aggression in north China was DOHIMARA, Kenji, the same man who instigated the Mukden Incident of 18 September 1931. All these men should be held responsible for the war of aggression. As to the narcotic policy and various atrocities committed in enemy occupied areas, which according to reports from all sides, were intensified as time went on.

Much to my regret I could not produce definite and strong evidences for these activities and atrocities since I had left for operations along Peiping-Hankow, Peiping-Taming, and Tientsin-Pukow Railway lines."

(Signed) "CHING Teh-Chun Formerly Mayor of Peiping and Concurrently Vice-Commander of the 29th Army

At present, Vice-Minister, Ministry of Military Operations"

0

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

20

23

24

25

COLONEL MORROW: I assume I may waive the reading of the certificate, in view of the testimony.

That completes the affidavit, if your Honor please.

THE FRESIDENT: The defense may cross-examine now.

MR. OHTA: I am OHTA, Kinjiro, counsel for the defendant, DOHIHARA. I would like to ask a few questions to the witness, General CHING Teh-chun.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. OHTA:

Q The witness stated that the two accounts had been taken by the prosecution upon oath. Were they really taken on oath?

A The first statement was a statement by me on the 2nd of Arril, which statement was a statement of conscience and factual accounts. I didn't write them under oath. The second statement was written on the 10th of June. The circumstances were the same. I wrote out of my conscience and according to facts, and was not under oath.

G		Then I repeat it again, it is not an
old ber	2	affidavit, is it?
	3	A This statement was firstly written and then
	4	as is proved correct, I gave my oath.
&		Q I have heard that in your country, that is,
В•	6	in China, there is a special formula for taking
a	7	statement. Did you comply with that formula?
r t	8	THE MONITOR: Correction? "what formula
o n	9	that you use."
	10	A When the prosecutor asked me whether the
*	11	statement I gave was true, I admitted that it was
	12	true and then I gave my oath. That is the form
	13	I adopted.
	14	Q Is the witness acquainted with Mr. Chen
	15	Ko, the Mayor of Tientsin at the time of June 1935?
	16	A Yes, I know.
	17	Q Is the witness acquainted with Mr. Chen
	18	
	19	Chueh-shen, the President of the Peining (Peiping-
	20	Liaoning) Railway Company?
	21	A Yes, I know.
		Q Was the so-called "DOIHARA-Ching Teh-Chun
	22	agreement' made as a result through the good offices of
	23	Mr. Chen Chueh-Shen and Mr. Chen Ko?
	24	A There was no so-called "Ching-DOIHARA agree-
	25	ment" in existence. "ith regard to the North Hopei

Affair, Ching, on the order of the Central Government, discussed the matter over with DOIHARA with a view to settle this matter temporarily. At the time, Chen Ko, the Mayor of Tientsin, and Chen Chueh-shen, Director of the Peining Army Railway Administration, were the people responsible for the interpretation.

North Chahar Incident -- the so-called "North Chahar Incident" -- are the facts concerning the North Chahar Incident like these? In July 1935 -- in June 1935, two officers and two men of the Japanese Army, when they were on their way to Kalgan via To Lun and Chang Peh Hsien riding in a motor car were fired upon by the Chinese garrison troops at the eastern gate of Chang Peh Hsien; and then they were beaten up by those Chinese guards and then they were taken, captured and detained at a military police station.

Was that the cause of the Incident?

THE MCNITOR: Correction: "Two Japanese officers and NCO's" instead of "soldiers". And another correction: "Northern gate" instead of "eastern gate" and "they were confined for four or five days."

A The facts are slightly different from what had occurred then. These are the facts. There were

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

then two Japanese officers and two NCO's travelling through Chang Peh Hsien at the Chang Peh Hsien gate, the gate of the country. They were demanded to produce their passports. These passports, according to the then regulations in force, would have to be presented by the Japanese Consulate with the understanding from the Chinese authorities. At that time the guards, the guard on duty at the gate asked the Japanese to produce their passports which the Japanese refused. As the Japanese refused to produce their passports, the guard, in order to carry out their duties, insisted on asking them to produce the passport. At that time they took the posture of aiming with their rifles they had on their hands at the Japanese but they never shot it. In the course of their quarreling a platoon leader came to the scene. Then this platoon leader took this Japanese to the inside of the city gate to the headquarters of 132nd Division. As soon as they got to the Division Headquarters' premises, the Japanese were given, were treated to a dinner and at the same time the platoon leader made a report to the authorities. As they were having their dinner there, and this report and so forth took some time of, say, three to four hours, they were never detained.

_.

21

22

23

Were not those negotiations terminated amicably on the 23rd of June and confirmed by the Central Government representatives on the 27th of the same month?

5

6

3

I cannot remember correctly the accurate date but I do remember it is around 20th of June when the settlement was brought forth. But, this settlement was a result of the concessions made by the Chinese Government with a view to secure peace.

9 10

11

12

13

11

15

In order to conclude those negotiations, did both the Japanese and the Chinese sides make considerable concessions in order to attain the peaceful conclusion of the treaty? Being motivated with a desire to conclude the negotiations peacefully, the Japanese side made considerable concessions as compared with the conditions put forward by them at the very outset of the negotiations, wasn't it

16 17

true?

19

18

20

21 2.1

23

24

25

THE MONITOR: Correction: "It may be that Chinese side made concessions but isn't it true that Japanese also, out of their desire for peace, softened up their initial demands and was not the agreement reached out of concession on both sides?"

The question was then temporarily settled.

But if you say that this was, the settlement was obtained through the repeated concessions made on the part of the Japanese, that is not true.

Q Was not the fact that the negotiations were concluded peacefully greatly welcomed by the Chinese side also?

A As I said just now, the Chinese Government, in order to secure peace, had under pains come to that settlement with the Japanese. It is not -- it was not an agreement cut of the wish of the Chinese people.

Aggression in North China" dated the tenth of June, 1946, you stated that aggression of the Japanese military clique did not cease until then, et cetera. However, were not these negotiations conducted peacefully with the hope to prevent the clash of the two parties?

A You said up to now the Japanese aggression has not been stopped. That is not the case. Up to now it is stopped but then it was not stopped. Will you please show me that paragraph?

(Whereupon, defense counsel brought the aforementioned document to interpreters' table.)

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess now until half past one. (Whereupon, at 1200, a recess was taken.)

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to state the reasons for this challenge for cause.

First, that there is no provision in the Charter for this additional appointment. The Charter provides: "The Tribunal shall consist of not less than six members nor more than eleven members, appointed by the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers from the names submitted by the Signatories to the Instrument of Surrender, India, and the Commonwealth of the Philippines." In accordance with the provisions of the Charter, this Tribunal has been completely constituted with the maximum of the members eligible for appointment. The Mor:ber now challenged is the twelfth appointee to this Tribunal. This appointment is expressly prohibited by the Charter. From the reading of the pertinent provisions of the Charter, the express intent is that the Tribunal will be fully constituted with a minimum of six members thereof, and the appointment of members over and above the maximum of eleven would open the door to allowing new members to sit in judgment upon the accused at any and all periods during this trial. The exercise of the authority for the appointment of members in excess of eleven could have no limits, to the end that any member or members could sit at different times in this proceeding. This would result

?

in a ridiculous situation as far as a just trial for the accused is concerned, all contrary to the intents and purposes of the Charter.

Next, that the addition of another member of this Tribunal, if permitted, would cause this trial to proceed clouded with a substantial doubt as to the legality, fairness, and the impartiality of this whole proceeding. That not having been present in court when a substantial part of the valid testimony was given and after other important proceedings had been completed, the appearance now of a new member will involve an appreciable risk to the substantial rights of the accused, which risk cannot be avoided by a private reading of the lengthy record, which, of itself, only amounts to a review and does not constitute the requirements of a fair and impartial trial. This contemplates hearing the witnesses, listening to the arguments of counsel, and taking part in the deliberations of the Tribunal at all stages of the proceeding.

Next, that having served as a high ranking general in the armed forces of one of the leading victorious accuser nations, impartiality is incompatible with this relationship and his past official duties. This fact alone presents a strong basis for a challenge for cause.

13

12

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

14

15

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

Four. The record in this case presents no evidence that the nomination of the challenged Member of this Tribunal has been made by a signatory to the Instrument of Surrender. Under the Charter, the nomination as well as evidence of appointment is essential to this record. There is no legal authority for the nomination and appointment or for the Charter under which the appointment is proposed.

Five. That the accused represented by this
American counsel, elects to exercise this right of
challenge for the reasons heretofore urged, and, therefore, moves that the newly designated Member of this
Tribunal disqualify himself and decline to serve as
a Member of this Tribunal.

In view of the recent resignation of the American representative on this Tribunal, Mr. Justice Higgins, and the acceptance or approval of the resignation by the Supreme Commander after the Court had been constituted and after it had begun hearing of the evidence and proceeded substantially with the trial of the issues involved and had completed two phases of the case and a major part of the third, it is moved that the Court declare this to be a mistrial, and that a new Tribunal be appointed under a valid Charter and in accordance therewith.

! :

2.1

It is further urged that those challenges for cause be sustained by this Tribunal and we pray for such further relief as is equitable under these circumstances.

I feel there are perhaps some other members of the defense counsel who would like to argue upon this proposition if the Court permits.

I would like to have this record show that this challenge for cause is made by the American counsel for OSHIMA, Hiroshi.

COLONEL MORROW: If the Court please, the prosecution, at any rate this section of the presecution, knew nothing about the sitting of General Cramer, knew nothing about this motion, has not seen the motion, and it is respectfully suggested that this matter be deferred until the prosecution has an opportunity to look into the motion and reply, if necessary, unless the Court decides to proceed without hearing from the prosecution.

THE PRESIDENT: We will hear all you have to say today. If you want further time, probably you will get it, but I will have to consult my colleagues about that.

Mr. Smith.

MR. SMITH: If your Honor please, on behalf

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

of Mr. HIROTA, I would like to move briefly for a mistrial because of the substitution and the seating of an American judge. The ground is that where the Court sits as both judge and jury we think that up until this time, without exception, the practice has always been for the accused to be confronted by his judge on the trial of the facts from the start to the finish of the trial. There has been practically a month of testimony in this case. A great deal of it has been very helpful to the defense. Witness after witness has appeared on the stand who did not testify to the facts that the prosecution evidently expected, and the new judge has lost the benefit and the defendant has been deprived of the right of the American judge to see and hear the witnesses and to appraise their credibility.

THE PRESIDENT: Two questions arise here, Mr. Smith: First the question of the power to make the appointment, and second, the question of expediency. The first question, the question of the power, is the one which I think was dealt with by Mr. Cunningham. But you are on the second question, that of expediency. Is that so?

MR. SMITH: Yes, sir.

8

9

10

11

12

13

1.1

16

17

18

19

20

21

THE PRESIDENT: On the question of power, I may remind you -- it will not help, of course -- that the French representative is the second appointment to this Court by his country, so that if your contention is correct, there has been a mistrial throughout.

MR. SMITH: If your Honor please, I have been here since the testimony began about a month ago and my recollection is that the French Justice has heard all the witnesses who have appeared.

Going back to your Honor's question, it is not only expediency but, as I understand it, one of the great cornerstones of the law which cannot be undone is that an accused is entitled in a trial to see and hear the witness who is against him. And it is hardly arguable otherwise.

THE PRESIDENT: I repeat there are two questions: The first one, the power to appoint; the second, the expediency of an appointment at this stage.

On the question of the power to appoint, I repeat the French Judge is the second appointment by his country.

MR. SMITH: I do not care to add anything more, your Honor, other than to observe that if this procedure could be followed after one month's testimony

22

23 24

is in, why couldn't it be done after six months' testimony is in?

Thank you very much.

THE PRESIDENT: The question of expediency is a question of fact. And to hold the American representative disqualified we must find as a fact that he cannot give a fair trial to the accused.

I am saying these things because I want them met. I cannot speak for the whole Court.

MR. WARREN: If the Tribunal please, I am the American counsel for General DOHIHARA and Admiral OKA. I have had no opportunity to personally speak with my clients, but I have talked with my associate Japanese counsel. We do not join in the motion.

CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: May it please the Tribunal-THE PRESIDENT: Captain Kleiman.

CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: On behalf of the defendant HIRANUMA, I have consulted with my Japanese co-counsel. I know the background of General Cramer, his reputation for fairness, and I welcome him. I welcome the representative of the United States on the Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Furness.

MR. FURNESS: May the Tribunal please, as American counsel for the accused SHIGEMITSU I wish to

join in the motion of Mr. Cunningham and the motion of Mr. Smith.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Logan.

MR. LOGAN: If it please the Tribunal,

Japanese and American counsel for Marquis KIDO have
no objection to Major General Cramer sitting in this
case.

THE PRESIDENT: Does any other counsel desire to be heard?

JUDGE HSIANG: Mr. President and Members of the Tribunal: As the Chinese prosecutor I do not speak for the prosecution as a whole. I merely speak for China.

China welcomes the full representation of eleven nations represented in this Tribunal. China especially does not like to see the non-representation of the United States of America on the bench.

This is an international tribunal. The rules of procedure and the rules relating to the admissibility of evidence, for instance, and some other matters are different in some respects from national courts. The grounds presented by the defense counsel for the motion I think in some respects do not apply to this International Tribunal. A reasonable interpretation of the Tribunal regarding the appointment,

I think there could not be more than eleven appointments at one single time. If there is one resignation
that resignation could be filled up by a new appointment. It is the belief of the Chinese prosecutor
that a new member upon assumption of duties, if he
studies the proceedings, can familiarize himself with
proceedings hitherto. There is no legal disability
for that Member to sit on the court.

For reasons stated above, China does not associate itself with the sentiments expressed in the motion.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: If the Court please, I only have two observations to make on what has been suggested.

Concerning the Member of the Tribunal from France, that matter was seriously considered and due to the fact that the second appointment was made before the Tribunal had been duly constituted and began listening to evidence, no objection was made.

On the second proposition of the resignation of one of the Members of the Tribunal, it is my thought that there is no provision in the Charter for such procedure. If the Charter or the framers of the Charter had contemplated such a situation, there is nothing which would have prevented them from including

that in the Charter; and due to the fact that it was not included we must assume that it was not intended.

On the matter of expediency, it is my thought that it would be much better for this trial to proceed with perhaps ten judges and not have the additional one, rather than have the proceedings clouded with the possibility of the illegality of the entire proceedings. Further on the matter of expediency, it is my thought that this is novel and new procedure. Very, very few precedents have ever been established on this proposition, including the matter of military tribunal practice and that this, a case of such importance, is, my thought, no place to begin establishing such precedents.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Warren.

MR. WARREN: If the Tribunal please, I do not like to be placed in the position of objecting to any defense motion, but for the interests of my two clients I do desire the presence of the new Member of this Tribunal.

I represent a military man and a naval man; and while we have one military man on the Tribunal, I should like another one who probably understands. In support of my position, I am bound to state that an additional member to a military tribunal or a military

court or courts-martial, as you will, is nothing unusual. 2 THE PRESIDENT: Have you looked at the German 3 Charter, Mr. Warren? 4 MR. WARREN: Sir? 5 THE PRESIDENT: Have you looked at the German 6 Charter? 7 MR. WARREN: Yes, sir, I have; and I have 8 looked at this Charter, also, and I feel that under 9 this Charter he can sit. 10 THE PRESIDENT: I understand that under the 11 German Charter representation of a country is excluded 12 after a certain time. There is no such provision in 13 14 our Charter. 15 MR. WARREN: That is right, sir. 16 THE PRESIDENT: Our Charter appears to con-17 template that so many nations will be represented. 18 Would there not be an implied power to maintain that 19 representation in the absence of anything to the con-20 trary? 21 If my recollection of the German Charter is 22 correct -- and it may not be -- then they saw fit 23 there to preclude the very position which you say 24 arises here without any provision. MR. WARREN: I am sorry, your Honor.

25

. 7

Yes, your Honor, I cannot agree that this Charter follows the German Charter, the Nuernberg Charter. There are dissimilar things in them. This Charter may be amended and re-amended.

A Member of this Tribunal, for instance, may become ill and leave and be gone for a period of time and come back and resume his duties. And if a member is replaced and replaced with another, it is my position that it is inherent in a military tribunal to do that. Because of the exigencies that arise from time to time in the field, the removal of officers who sit on military courts from one jurisdiction to another—

9

10

20

As I stated, the necessity for removal of officers from time to time even from a military court, you must have a replacement. Otherwise many, many culprits would go unpunished.

THE PRESIDENT: Did I hear you say that vacancies have to be filled on military courts; otherwise offenses would go unpunished?

MR. WARREN: In this respect, your Honor:
An American general courts-martial is comprised of
not less than five members. It might be that those
members would go below five, and if you could not
replace a tribunal it might mean the starting of
another case and continued operation until such time

as your witnesses in the passage of time with the witnesses' loss of memory or other documents or other things that it could well be that a culprit might not go punished. It is not unknown.

THE PRESIDENT: Suppose six members of this Court were killed in, say, a motor car accident or a plane accident, so that a quorum could not be obtained. Would that terminate the proceedings without a verdict?

MR. WARREN: Not necessarily. As I view military tribunals, and I think those who are familiar with at least American courts-martial, and Manual for Courts-martial would know that the Tribunal could be increased by appointment by qualification.

THE PRESIDENT: Why couldn't this Tribunal be increased by further appointments?

- 3

1-1

:3

G 1 2 e n

b e 4 r

3

g 5 & 6

7 B a 8

r

10 11

13

12

14 15

16

17

63

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

MR. WARREN: If the Supreme Allied Commander had the authority to draw up the Charter in the first place he has authority to amend it, and he can amend it and has amended it.

THE PRESIDENT: I don't know what the tenor of your argument is, but I suppose you are really admitting that if there is power to cancel there ought to be power to amend.

M . WARREN: That is right. Maybe I have not made myself plain. I ar arguing in opposition to the motion. I thought I had made myself plain, and I thought the Tribunal understood me, but perhaps it didn't. Certainly, I am in favor of the new member sitting as a Member of this Tribunal, and think that the Supreme Allied Commander has every right to appoint him. And the only test, it appears to be, is, can the new Justice of this Tribunal familiarize himself enough with what has gone on in the past to be able to render a fair and impartial judgment in the case? My position is that he can read the record and can do that. That, of course, is a question of fact.

It is my further position that if the Supreme Allied Commander did not think that he could he would not have appointed him.

3 1

10.

There is only one further requisite that I am sure the Member himself is familiar with, being familiar with military law as he is, and that is, if in his own judgment he cannot sit and render a fair and impartial judgment in the case, he would himself disqualify, and I feel certain that he would do so. Having offered himself, I feel that he feels himself qualified.

Now, my argument does not necessarily mean that I agree with these principles of law, but they are law as I view them, as made so by the Charter and by military law as I understand it. And, in this particular instance, I would like the Tribunal to consider seriously what I have to say concerning the qualifications of the new Member of the Tribunal.

CAPTAIN KLEIMAN: I am sorry to disturb your Honor again. I wish to call the Tribunal's attention to Article 4c of the Charter which reads,

"Absence. If a member at any time is absent and afterwards is able to be present, he shall take part in all subsequent proceedings; unless he declares in open court that he is disqualified by reason of insufficient familiarity with the proceedings which took place in his absence."

Such provision, may it please your Honor, is not in accordance with the setting up and action on the part of Members of civil or military courts as I know them in the United States. I don't think it lends toward a fair trial, However, as long as this provision is allowed to remain in the Charter, I don't think any greater evil is accomplished by allowing a new Member to come in and acquaint himself with the proceedings, and I know that General Cramer has that ability and has that sense of fairness that, unless he can fully and completely acquaint himself with the facts in this case, he, himself, would disqualify himself; and I request, if the Tribunal decides in favor of the motion made by the American counsel, that the Tribunal ask of the Supreme Commander to amend the Charter to allow the representasive of the United States to remain on the Tribunal.

3

8

9

10

11

12

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE PRESIDENT: The Court will treat Captain Kleiman's request as a submission.

MR. FURNESS: If the Court please, lest there be misunderstanding, I speak in favor of the challenge and in favor of the motion for a mistrial.

Colonel Warren has argued that under military law, procedure substitutions can be made. That is so in court martials. The reason it is so is because the Articles of War have the specific provision for it. It is also true of the military commissions trying cases in Yokohama and Manila. The reason it is true is because the order appointing those commissions has a specific provision for substitutions.

THE PRESIDENT: This is not incompatible for a fair trial with Americans, but you are submitting it is incompatible for a fair trial with Japanese.

MR. FURNESS: I am arguing, sir, that there is no provision in this Charter and that I believe the omission is intentional.

I also wish to point out that, under the Articles of War, if the number of men sitting is reduced below a certain amount, the case must begin again de novo.

As to the Nuernberg Charter, I would like to point out that, under that Charter, there is a specific provision for alternates who sit throughout the trial who hear exactly the same evidence as that heard by the Judges sitting; and, if he withdraws or is withdrawn, that they sit as Judge and act on their own knowledge. I believe that there is a specific provision in that Charter, too, that there

shall be no substitutions. THE PRESIDENT: We will recess now for fifteen minutes. We may or may not be in a position to give our decision. We understand we have heard all the arguments, and we reserve our decision. (Whereupon, at 1445, a recess was taken until 1515, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

Wolf & Spratt	1	MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The Tribunal is
	2	now resumed.
	3	THE PRESIDENT: The Tribunal, by a majority
	4	holds that General Cramer, the American representative,
	5	is eligible to sit as a Member of this Tribunal, and
	6	dismisses the motion. General Cramer took no part in
	7	the decision.
	8	Mr. Smith.
	9	MR. SMITH: If your Honor please, in order
	10	to save the record, and on behalf of all counsel who
	11	did object, I would like to ask your Honor to allow
	12	the usual exception.
	13	THE PRESIDENT: The application for the
	14	exception is recorded.
	15	Is there any further cross-examination of
	16	the witness?
	17	MR. OHTA: I am counsel OHTA for the de-
	13	fendant, DOHIHARA.
	19	CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)
	20	BY MR. OHTA:
	21	Q I should like to have the witness reply to
	22	a question addressed to him this morning.
	23	A Prior to the recess the defense counsel
	24	was asking the question about the statement I made,
	25	that is, after the settlement of Chapei Affairs, the

Japanese aggression has never stopped. The opinion I gave in that statement was that the Chinese government, desiring to secure peace, had under terrible conditions, come to a settlement with the Japanese over the question of Chapei Affairs; but the military aggression undertaken on the part of the Japanese militarists had never ceased, even after the Chapei settlement was effected. By the statement, "has never stopped —— the agression has never stopped," I meant to say that Japanese military aggression has never stopped after the agreement was signed. It is not that up until now the aggression has never stopped.

Q That is all I wish to know with respect to this point. Next, I should like to put a question with respect to the establishment of the Hopei-Chabar Political Council. According to your affidavit, Mr. Witness, the defendant, DOHIHARA, went to Peiping in September, 1935, and stayed there until the establishment of the Hopei-Chahar Political Council. There seems to be some error in that statement, and I wish to point out to you that, although he stayed in Peiping, he frequently went to Tientsin; is that not a fact?

A General DOHIHARA, it seems to me, was then living in the most eastern three provinces. He frequently came to Peiping, and frequently went to Tientsin.

1	Q Then, is it not a mistake to state tha
2	DOHIHARA went frequently to Peiping for purposes o
3	his project in September, 1935?
4	A In 1936, June, I had negotiated with
5	DOHIHARA in regard to matters pertaining to Chapei
6	Ever since September, 1935, up to February, 1936,
7	I had frequently seen DOHIHARA.
8	THE PRESIDENT: This is a convenient
9	break. We will adjourn now until 9:30 tomorrow
0	morning.
1	(Whereupon, at 1600, an adjourn-
3	ment was taken until Tuesday, 23 July 1946, at
1	0930.)
5	
,	
,	